



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,895	11/07/2006	Tadahiro Ohmi	039262-0165	8302
23428 7590 12/15/2009 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007			EXAMINER BROWN, VALERIE N	
			ART UNIT 2829	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/15/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/594,895

Applicant(s)

OHMI ET AL.

Examiner

VALERIE BROWN

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 20040245584 (Murakawa et al).

Concerning claim 1, **Murakawa** discloses a plasma processing method in which plasma is generated by the use of a plasma excitation gas ([0088] lines 1-4) and a process gas is introduced into said plasma to thereby process an object to be processed ([0092]), but does not disclose said plasma processing method being characterized in that said process gas includes nitrous oxide gas and said nitrous oxide gas is introduced into the plasma whose electron temperature is less than binding energy 2.24 eV between a nitrogen molecule and an oxygen atom in said nitrous oxide. However **Murakawa** discloses using an electron temperature of 0.7 to 2 eV for an oxidation process ([0088] lines 7-12) and that NO, N₂O, NO₂ and NH₃ could be used instead of the oxygen source ([0093]). Additionally **Murakawa** discloses that the reaction conditions (electron temperature included) may be any kind so long as a high quality film is formable. Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating

such concentration or temperature is critical. “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Therefore, absent any evidence that the claimed electron temperature provides new and unexpected results it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform routine experimentation to determine an optimal electron temperature and accordingly optimize the device manufacturing process.

Continuing to claim 3, **Murakawa** discloses a method of manufacturing an electronic device characterized by comprising a step of carrying out an oxynitriding process to said object to be processed by the use of the plasma processing method according to claim 1 ([0091] note that it is disclosed that the nitride processing unit forms the nitride film by nitriding a part of the surface of the silicon oxide film thereby making an oxynitride film at least at the interface between the nitride layer and the oxide layer).

3. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 20040245584 (Murakawa et al) in view of US6830652 (Ohmi et al).

Regarding claim 2, **Murakawa** discloses introducing a plasma excitation gas into a process chamber and introducing the nitrous oxide gas into the plasma, but does not disclose introducing the plasma excitation gas into a process chamber from an upper shower plate, generating said plasma under said upper shower plate causing said plasma to pass through a lower shower plate provided under said upper shower plate so as to reach said object to be processed and introducing the nitrous oxide gas from the lower shower plate into the plasma under said lower shower plate. However, **Ohmi** discloses a plasma processing apparatus that has

a dielectric shower plate (103) and a lattice-like shower plate (111) in a configuration in which the dielectric in which the dielectric shower plate (which supplies the plasma excitation gas) is above (therefore the upper shower plate) the lattice-like shower plate (which supplies the process gas) (therefore making it the lower shower plate) and the plasma is caused to pass through the lattice-like shower plate to reach a substrate below, and that this configuration provides a greatly improved freedom of the process and higher-speed processes (column 4 lines 15- 61). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the configuration as disclosed by **Ohmi** in plasma processing in order to have higher speed processes and reduce the amount of time need to manufacture the devices.

Continuing to claim 4, **Murakawa** in view of **Ohmi** discloses a method of manufacturing an electronic device characterized by comprising a step of carrying out an oxynitriding process to said object to be processed by the use of the plasma processing method according to claim 1 (**Murakawa** [0091] note that it is disclosed that the nitride processing unit forms the nitride film by nitriding a part of the surface of the silicon oxide film thereby making an oxynitride film at least at the interface between the nitride layer and the oxide layer).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VALERIE BROWN whose telephone number is (571)270-5015. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:00am-3:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Valerie Brown/
Examiner, Art Unit 2829
12/07/09

/Ha T. Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2829